

Daniel L. Rottinghaus, Esq., State Bar No. 131949
Paul W. Windust, State Bar No. 167338
BERDING & WEIL LLP
3240 Stone Valley Road West
Alamo, California 94507
Telephone: 925/838-2090
Facsimile: 925/820-5592

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ROBERT L. YOUNG

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ROBERT L. YOUNG,
Plaintiff,
vs.

ILLINOIS UNION INSURANCE
COMPANY; ACE WESTCHESTER
SPECIALTY CLAIMS; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,
Defendants.

No. C 07-05711 SBA

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

**DATE: 8/26/08
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
CTRM: 3**

[FRCP 56(a) and (b)]

Plaintiff ROBERT L. YOUNG's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment came on regularly for hearing with counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant present in Court. The Court, having reviewed the moving and opposing papers, and having heard argument from counsel, hereby rules as follows:

Plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment on the duty to defend issue is GRANTED. IUI's Policy promised Young that it would defend any Claim even if the allegations were groundless, false, or fraudulent. Under the Policy, "Claim" means any written or oral demand for damages or other relief against TRI and the directors and officers. The Raybern Cross-Complaint is a Claim as that term is defined by the Policy.

1 In order to obtain partial summary judgment of an insurer's duty to defend,
 2 Plaintiff need only establish that there is a triable issue of fact on the insurer's
 3 coverage defense. *Maryland Casualty Co. v. National American Ins. Co.* (1996) 48
 4 Cal.App.4th 1822, 1832. Because Plaintiff is the moving party, he has the initial
 5 burden of establishing a potential for coverage. See *Montrose Chem. Corp. v.*
 6 *Superior Court.*, (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 287, 300; *Vann v. Travelers Cos.*, (1995) 39 Cal.
 7 App. 4th 1610, 1614. The Raybern Cross-Complaint makes allegations that
 8 establish a potential for coverage.

9 Once the insured makes the prima facie showing, the insurer faces the same
 10 burden it would encounter if it were the moving party – to prove there is no
 11 possibility of coverage. See *id.* "In other words, the insured need only show that
 12 the underlying claim may fall within policy coverage; the insurer must prove it
 13 cannot." *Vann*, 39 Cal. App. 4th at 1614.

14 In opposing the motion, it is the Defendants' burden to conclusively negate
 15 coverage; that is, to establish its coverage defense as a matter of law. Defendants'
 16 have failed to make this showing. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to partial
 17 summary judgment as to the duty to defend.

18 DATED: _____

19
20 _____
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22

23 O:\WDOCS\0001\392\PLD\00478156.DOC
24
25
26
27
28